DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 096 PS 008 802

AUTHOR Takanishi, Ruby
TITLE Evaluation for Program Development: A Primer for Staff and Parents in Child Development Programs.
PUB DATE 13 Mar 76
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the California Association for the Education of Young Children Conference (Sacramento, California, March 13, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; *Child Development; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Objectives; *Evaluation Methods; Formative Evaluation; *Guides; Measurement; Measurement Techniques; Parent Participation; *Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Staff Role; Summative Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This primer is designed to provide an introduction to evaluation and its potential value in assisting staffs and parents to provide high quality child development programs for young children. A discussion of two types of evaluation (summative and formative) is followed by a step-by-step program for formative evaluation which includes (1) making a commitment to program improvement, (2) deciding on the focus of evaluation, (3) stating goals and objectives, (4) collecting relevant information, and (5) using the information for program improvement. Useful references are cited for each topic. A bibliography of evaluations of child development programs, and a listing of selected sources for measurement techniques and instruments are also included. Appendixed are the Spodek framework for analyzing programs and a formative evaluation summary worksheet. (MS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED128096

7.76

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Evaluation for Program Development

A Primer for Staff and Parents in Child Development Programs

Ruby Takanishi

Early Childhood Development Program

Graduate School of Education

University of California, Los Angeles

Summer 1976

PS 008802

Contents

	Page
Purpose of This Primer	1
What is Evaluation?	1
How to Begin	3
Step 1. Making a Commitment to Program Improvement	3
Step 2. Deciding on the Focus of Your Evaluation	3
Step 3. Stating Your Goals and Objectives	5
Step 4. Collecting Relevant Information	6
Step 5. Using the Information for Program Improvement	7
How to Continue--Evaluation as a Program Goal	8
Resources	
Bibliography--Evaluations of Child Development Programs	9
Selected Sources for Measurement Techniques and Instruments	12
Addresses	14
Appendix I. Spodek Framework for Analyzing Programs	15
Appendix II. Formative Evaluation Summary Worksheet	17
Acknowledgements	18

PURPOSE OF THIS PRIMER

The word evaluation immediately raises the suspicions of individuals involved in developing and providing programs of young children. Evaluation is viewed as something which is "done to the program from the outside" without much communication between the evaluators and the program participants. Unfortunately, evaluations have also become associated with the possibility of assigning blame for "program failures" or with the threat of withdrawing funds. Quite clearly and justifiably, the word evaluation has acquired a "bad name."

This primer is not designed to make evaluation experts out of staff and parents in child development programs. Its purpose is modest and limited: to provide an introduction to evaluation and its potential value in assisting staffs and parents to provide "the very best programs" for young children.[1] Thus the primer is based on the assumption that all individuals involved with young children desire programs which promote the full development of children, parents, and staff. The facilitation of child development is seen as inseparable from an effort to improve programs through continuous evaluation.

WHAT IS EVALUATION?

Evaluation can be defined as a human judgmental process which attempts to determine the value of a thing (Anderson, Ball, & Murphy, 1974). There are several key words in this definition. Evaluation involves a HUMAN JUDGMENTAL PROCESS. Thus evaluators are people who differ widely in the questions they ask, the procedures they use, the kinds of statistical analyses they make, and their judgement of the usefulness of the findings to the program or decision makers. Thus, every evaluation--no matter how sophisticated--is roundly criticized when it appears. The methodologists attack the study's sampling, design, procedures, and analyses. The administrators and staff claim the study did not evaluate what they were trying to accomplish. While all of these claims have legitimacy, they are related to disagreements in how to determine the value of a thing.

There are many models for guiding the conduct of evaluation. Each individual selects the mode which is best suited to her setting, goals, and resources. The two most general types of evaluation include the summative and formative modes (Scriven, 1967).

---

[1] This primer is being developed on an experimental basis, and will be revised based on feedback from individuals using it. If you have any suggestions for its improvement, please write or call the author.

Summative evaluation. This mode of evaluation is most typically used to determine the overall effectiveness of large-scale federal or state programs, and often has legislative or policy implications. Teams of evaluation specialists who are not connected with the programs conduct the evaluation. Summative evaluation aims to determine the worth of programs independent of specific programs in local communities. Since there is a need to know whether "the entire program" is working, standardized tests and procedures are typically used.

There are many difficulties involved in summative type evaluations. Local variations and emphases are often overlooked. Children's performances on standardized tests are often not good indicators of the children's capacities and of the program's impact. However, the needs of funding agencies and legislators to have information on program effectiveness appears to assure summative evaluation a secure future.

One bright spot in the area of summative evaluation is the trend not to conduct this kind of evaluation during the first two to three years of a program's initial implementation. When a program is just beginning, a formative mode of evaluation (see below) is highly desirable.

Formative evaluation. This mode of evaluation aims at determining how well a program is meeting its stated goals in its own setting. Formative evaluation is typically used to revise and improve programs so that the goals are more adequately attained or are changed. Ideally, this kind of evaluation should be built in as an ongoing part of a quality child development program.

Formative evaluation can be conducted by parents and staff. There are two widely available and highly interesting accounts of parent and staff involvement in formative evaluation (Greenberg, 1969; McSpadden, undated). While the assistance of an outside evaluation specialist is desirable and can greatly facilitate the evaluation process,[2] individuals in the program can conduct formative evaluations as outlined in the following sections.

References

Anderson, S., Ball, S., & Murphy, R. T. (Eds.) Encyclopedia of educational evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Greenberg, P. The devil has slippery shoes. A biased biography of the child development group of Mississippi. New York: MacMillan, 1969.

McFadden, L. A. Formative evaluation: Parents and staff working together to build a responsive environment. Washington, D.C.: Day Care and Child Development Council of America, undated.

---

[2] Sources for technical assistance include the department of research and evaluation of the school district, state department of education, local colleges and universities, and research institutes. In selecting a consultant for the evaluation of child development programs, it is important that s/he have a sensitivity to children, parents, staff, and community. Human relations skills are as important as technical ones.

HOW TO BEGIN

The following steps comprise a beginning attempt to carry out formative evaluation: (1) making a commitment to program improvement, (2) deciding on the focus of your evaluation, (3) stating your goals and objectives, (4) collecting relevant information, and (5) using the information for program improvement. Each of these steps will be described below.

STEP 1. MAKING A COMMITMENT TO PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT. A well-known, very honest evaluator asked the question, "Who likes to be evaluated?" He answered his own question, "No one!" Beginning an evaluation can be threatening to individuals who fear their competencies will be questioned. This is a natural way of feeling, one which must be dealt with BEFORE the evaluation begins.

Thus it must be clearly understood by the participants that the evaluation is aimed at improving the program for children, not to single out any individual for blame. Everyone must make a commitment to program improvement which involves self-examination and open communication.

Step 1 is never completely accomplished. It will be necessary to return several times to the re-establishment of this commitment during the next five steps. Participants may find it useful to read the following stimulating articles as a means for beginning an evaluation effort in your program.

Useful References for Step 1

Frank, L. Evaluation of educational programs. Young Children, January 1969, 164-174.

Katz, L. G. Where is early childhood education going? Theory into practice, 1973, XII, 2, 137-142.

Kilmer, S., & Weinberg, R. The nature of young children and the state of early education: Reflections from the Minnesota Roundtable. Young Children, 1974, XXX, 1, 60-67.

STEP 2. DECIDING ON THE FOCUS OF YOUR EVALUATION. Once there is a commitment on the part of staff and parents to improving the program, a decision must be made regarding the focus of the evaluation.

A note on needs assessment. Everyone has probably heard the term "needs assessment." Briefly, needs assessment refers to the process by which needs (a condition in which there is a gap between what exists and what

---

[3]Robert E. Stake. The countenance of educational evaluation. Teachers College Record, April 1967, 68(4)

is desired) are identified and priorities for meeting these needs are established. Deciding upon a focus for evaluation is a form of needs assessment. In programs serving children, the evaluation could focus on any one of the following areas. The focus should originate in staff and parent concerns regarding any aspect of the program:

1. Physical facilities, spatial arrangements, and the use of time. Concerns: How can we provide private places for children? How can the room be arranged to balance quiet and active activities? Is the design of physical space congruent with our goals?

2. Curriculum areas including sensorimotor skills, language, mathematics, science, social studies, the arts (music, dance, painting), and dramatic play. Concerns: Is the curriculum based on the developmental needs of the children? Are the activities we provide consistent (or inconsistent) with the goals for children?

3. Parent involvement and participation. Concerns: How can we involve more parents in the program? How do parents participate now? How can we meet parents' needs in our program?

4. Use of community resources, including social services. Concerns: What are community resources which are needed in our program? What resources do we need to bring into our program?

5. Staff training/development. Concerns: What are staff needs for inservice training? How can we identify and utilize special talents of the staff?

6. Materials, including books, curriculum kits and packages, games, workbooks, films. Concerns: What materials are being used (or not used)? Do our present materials support our program goals? How can we evaluate materials before commiting ourselves to purchasing them? (See Appendix I)

7. Children, including the effects of the program on different areas of development.

Several meetings may be necessary to obtain a list of foci for an evaluation. It is critical that all groups of individuals concerned with the programs be involved in generating this list. These groups will vary depending upon the community, but would at least include parents, staff, and administrators at different levels and community organizations.

Once areas for evaluation are identified, a survey should be made regarding their relative importance. This information can be collected by listing each area on a form with two scales of five points: (1) importance of area (1=Not important at all to 5=Very important), (2) extent of achievement (1=Very low to 5=Very high achievement).

The survey should then be distributed to a random sample of members of different groups involved in the above process. If the groups are small in number, the survey can be sent to all potential respondents. The use of a consultant on survey research may be important at this stage depending on the size of your potential sample.

Mail or personally distribute the survey depending on your situation. If the response is less than 50%, a follow up--by phone or face-to-face--should be conducted.

For a clear description of compiling the survey data, see Morgan (1975).

Useful Reference for Step 2

Morgan, J. M. Conducting local needs assessment: A guide. Princeton, N.J.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement, & Evaluation, 1975.

STEP 3. STATING YOUR GOALS AND OBJECTIVES. Once the evaluation's focus has been identified, the goals and objectives of the program component must be stated. Depending on the stage of a program's development, a statement of goals may or may not be well articulated. For those programs which do not yet have stated goals, Step 3 may take a considerable amount of time.

Goals are defined as desired outcomes or end results and are usually stated in global terms, e.g., "to support the optimal development of the child;" "to create an environment to develop the whole child." Goals are typically difficult to evaluate without a specification of objectives.

Objectives are concrete, specific, and observable behaviors or activities which lead to the achievement of the program's goals. Typically, a set of objectives is identified for each program goal. The achievement of some or all of the objectives for each goal is an indication of goal attainment.

Programs have recently been encouraged to state all goals in terms of objectives. There are some questions regarding the usefulness of this approach (Eisner, 1967). The focus on specific, observable behaviors may limit the outcomes of a program to a narrow range. Objectives which cannot be easily stated may be considered unimportant. There is also the danger that objectives focus concern on end-products without sufficient attention to the processes which led to their achievement.

Given these cautions, it is important to try to specify as clearly as possible what can be accepted as evidence that program goals are being attained. In many cases, the availability of stated objectives can facilitate the collection of information in an evaluation.

Useful References for Step 3

Eisner, E. W. Educational objectives: Help or hindrance? School Review, 1967, 75 (3).

Mager, R. F. Preparing instructional objectives. Palo Alto, Calif.: Fearon Publishers, 1962.

McAshan, J. H. Writing behavioral objectives. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

STEP 4. COLLECTING RELEVANT INFORMATION. Once your objectives are clearly stated, you are now in a position to collect some information on them. There are many ways to collect relevant information. The method you use will depend on your objectives and the skills and resources you have available for the evaluation. The following table shows different measurement approaches and useful references.

Table 1

Measurement Approaches

Approach	Reference
Checklists	Day care checklist: Home care, family day care homes, day care centers. Washington, D.C.: Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1972.
Criterion-Referenced Measurement	Klein, S. P., & Kosecoff, J. Issues and procedures in the development of criterion-referenced tests. Princeton, N.J.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement, and Evaluation, 1973.
	Lillie, D. L. Early childhood education. An individualized approach to developmental instruction. Chicago: SRA, 1975.
Interviews	Zamoff, R. B. Guide to the assessment of day care services and needs at the community level. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 1971.
Observations	Cohen, D. H., & Stern. V. Observing and recording the behavior of young children. New York: Teachers College Press, 1958.
	Mattick, I., & Perkins, F. J. Guidelines for observation and assessment: An approach to evaluating the learning environment of a day care center. Washington, D.C.: Day Care and Child Development Council of America.
	Cartwright, C. A., & Cartwright, G. P. Developing observational skills. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Questionnaires	Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire design and attitude measurement. New York: Basic Books, 1966.
Ratings	Evaluating children's progress: A rating scale for children. Washington, D.C.: Day Care and Child Development Council of America.
Standardized Tests	Bradley, R. H., & Caldwell, B. M. Issues and procedures for testing young children. Princeton, N.J.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement and Evaluation, 1974.
Unobtrusive Measures (e.g., attendance records, documents, cumulative folder information, children's products)	Webb, E. J. et al. Unobtrusive measures: Nonreactive research in the social sciences. New York: Rand McNally, 1966.

Useful References for Step 4

Cazden, C. B. Some questions for research in early childhood education. In J. C. Stanley (Ed.), Preschool programs for the disadvantaged, 188-200.

Eash, M. J., Talmadge, H., & Walberg, H. J. Evaluation design for pactitioners. ERIC Clearinhouse on Tests, Measurement, and Evaluation, TM Report 35, December 1974.

Gordon, I. J. An instructional theory approach to the analysis of selected early childhood programs. In I. J. Gordon (Ed.), Early childhood education, NSSE Yearbook, 1972, 203-228.

Gordon, I. J., & Jester, R. E. Techniques for observing teaching in early childhood. In R. M. W. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research on teaching, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, 184-215.

Messick, S., & Barrows, T. S. Strategies for research and evaluation in early education. In I. J. Gordon (Ed.), Early childhood education, The Seventy-First Yearbook of the NSSE, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972, 261-290.

STEP 5. USING INFORMATION FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT. Engaging in an evaluation is worthless if it is not used for improving the program. Once the information has been summarized, plan a meeting for staff and parents to present the findings. A worksheet (Appendix II) which summarizes the activities of Stages 3-5 may be useful.

In sharing your findings, the following outline may be helpful:

1. Describe why the evaluation was undertaken. Why was there a focus on specific goals? Who helped to focus evaluation and identify goals?

2. Describe what procedures you used to collect the information.

3. Share your findings. Give the participants a chance to respond to what you have done. If the group is large (more than eight people), this might be a time to break up into small discussion groups. After the discussion period these groups share their reactions with the total group.

4. End the meeting by either:

   a. Discussing what improvement can be made in light of the evaluation, identifying who will be responsible for implementing or changes, and when the results will be reported to the group.

   b. Organizing a group whose task is to make specific suggestions for improvement which will be presented at a subsequent meeting. A time interval should be specified for the report. Group members who are not on this special task group should be encouraged to submit their ideas to the task group.

Number 5 above is critical to a formative evaluation effort, which depends on the use of information collected for program development. If the information is not incorporated into the program, the formative evaluation has not been successful.

Useful Reference for Step 5

Hawkridge, D. F., Campeau, P. L., & Trickett, P. K. Preparing evaluation reports: A guide for authors. AIR Monograph No. 6, Pittsburgh: American Institutes for Research, 1970.

HOW TO CONTINUE--EVALUATION AS A PROGRAM GOAL

Perhaps the time will come when formative evaluation for program improvement will be as important a goal of our programs as a child's development. It is somewhat paradoxical that our programs center on the continuing, ongoing development of the child, but we seldom make provisions that our programs and adults develop also.

There is potential for evaluation to ensue whenever anyone asks the questions: "Are we meeting the needs of the children in our program? How can we improve what we are doing?" Formative evaluation should be an ongoing process in any program serving children and their families. Once the findings of one evaluation study are implemented for program improvement, another evaluation study should begin to determine the adequacy of the improvements. Thus, evaluation becomes central to a continuous, program-renewing process.

RESOURCES

Bibliography-Evaluations of Child Development Programs

Reviews of Research and Evaluation Studies

The following items are extensive reviews of research and evaluation studies conducted on programs for infants and children.

Beller, E.K. Research on Organized Programs of Early Education. In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching (R.M.W. Travers, Ed.) Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, pp. 530-600.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Is early intervention effective? A Report on Longitudinal Evaluations of Preschool Programs. DHEW Publication No. (OHD) 74-25.

Federal Programs for Young Children: Review and Recommendations. Vol. II: Review of Evaluation Data for Federally Sponsored Projects for Young Children. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Evaluation of Media Programs

Ball, S. & Bogatz, G.A. Research on Sesame Street: Some implications for Compensatory education. Proceedings of the Second Annual Hyman Blumberg Symposium on Research in Early Childhood Education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1972.

Ball, S. & Bogatz, G. A. Summative research of Sesame Street: Implications for the study of preschool children. In A.D. Pick (Ed.), Minnesota symposia on child psychology, Vol. 6. University of Minnesota Press, 1972.

Palmer, E.L. Formative research in the production of television for children. In D.R. Olson (Ed.), Media and symbols: The forms of experience, communication, and education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Evaluation of Day Care Programs

Kirchner, E. & Vondracek, S. An Assessment Inventory for the Day Care Child, Vol. I. Background, Development, and Sample. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University College of Human Development, 1972.

Kirchner, E. An Assessment Inventory for the Day Care Child--Field Evaluation and Preliminary Findings.

Prescott, E. et al. Day care as a child-rearing environment. Day care: Vol. 2. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1972.

Sale, J.S. Final Report. Community Family Day Care Project. Pacific Oaks College, February 1973.

Evaluation of Head Start and Follow Through

Westinghouse Report

Westinghouse Learning Corporation. The Impact of Head Start: An Evaluation of the Effects of Head Start on Children's Cognitive and Affective Development, 1969.

Cicirelli, V.G., Evans, J.W. & Schiller, J. A Reply to the Report Analysis. Harvard Educational Review, 1970, 40, 105-129.

Stanford Research Institute Reports

Stanford Research Institute: Interim evaluation of national Follow Through, 1969-1971. A technical report. Prepared for Follow Through Program, U.S. Office of Education, February 1973. Note especially chapters 1, 2, 3, 5.

Classroom Observation Study of Implementation in Head Start Planned Variation, 1970-1971. Menlo Park: SRI, 1973.

Stallings, J. and Kaskowitz, D. Follow Through program classroom observation evaluation 1972-1973. Menlo Park: SRI, 1974.

Stallings, J. An Implementation Study of Seven Follow Through Models for Education. AERA, 1974.

Evaluation of Parent Involvement Programs in Early Education

Chilman, C. Programs for Disadvantaged Parents. In Bettye Caldwell and H. Ricciuti (Eds.) Review of Child Development Research. Vol. 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Kirschner Associates. A National Survey of the Impacts of Head Start Centers on Community Institutions. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Bilingual and Bicultural Programs for Young Children

Cornejo, Richard. A Synthesis of Theories and Research on the Effects of Teaching in First and Second Languages. Implications for Bilingual Education. Austin: National Educational Laboratory Publishers, Inc., June 1974.

Gardner, Bruce A. The First Seventy-Six Bilingual Education Projects. In James E. Alatis (Ed.), Bilingualism and Language Contact. Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1970.

John, Vera and Horner. Early Childhood Bilingual Education. New York: Modern Language Association, 1971.

RESOURCES

Selected Sources for Measurement Techniques and Instruments

Berger, B. An annotated bibliography of measurement for young children. New York: Center for Urban Education, 1969.

Bloom, Benjamin, Hastings, T. and Madaus, G. (Eds.) Handbook of summative and formative evaluation. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

- Cazden, C.B. Evaluation of Learning in Preschool Education: Early Language Development, pp. 354-398.

- Kamii, C.K. Evaluation of Learning in Preschool Education: Socio-emotional, Perceptual-motor and Cognitive Development, pp. 281-344.

Beatty, W. H. Improving educational assessment and an inventory of measures of affective behavior. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1969.

Brandt, B.M. Studying behavior in natural settings. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.

Buros, Oscar K. (Ed.) The seventh mental measurements yearbook, Vol. I, II. Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1972.

Coller, A.R. Systems for the observation of classroom behavior in early childhood education. Urbana, Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education, publication number 1300-28, April 1972.

Educational Testing Service. Test Collection Bulletin and Head Start Test Collection Reports. Princeton, N.J.: Edcuational Testing Service.

Hoepfner, R. et al. CSE elementary school test evaluations. Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA Graduate School of Education, 1970.

Hoepfner, R., Stern, C., & Nummandal, S.G. CSE-ECRC Preschool/kindergarten test evaluations. Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA Graduate School of Education, 1970.

Johnson, O.G., and Bommarito, J.W. Tests and measurements in child development: A handbook. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Measures of maturation. An anthology of early childhood observation instruments. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1973.

Mussen, P.H. (Ed.) Handbook of Research Methods in Child Psychology. New York: John Wiley, 1960.

Oppenheim, A.N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Simon, A., & Boyer, E. G. (Eds.) Mirrors for behavior: An anthology of classroom observation instruments. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1967-1970.

Straus, M. A. Family measurement techniques: Abstracts of published instruments, 1935-1965. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.

Tyler, L. L., Klein, M. F., & Associates. Evaluating and choosing curriculum and instructional materials. Los Angeles: Educational Resource Associates, 1976.

Walker, D. K. Socioemotional measures for preschool and kindergarten children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Webb, E. J., Campbell, D. T., Schwartz, R. D., & Sechrest, L. Unobtrusive measures: Nonreactive research in the social sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1966.

RESOURCES

Addresses

Day Care and Child Development Council of America
1012 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

The Council publishes Resources for Child Care, a catalogue of publications including program evaluation.

EPIE (Education Products Information Exchange)
P.O. Box 2379
Grand Central Station
New York, NY 10017

EPIE publishes a journal, EPIE Forum, which contains evaluation of programs and educational products.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education
805 West Pennsylvania Avenue
Urbana, IL 61801

ERIC publishes bibliographies on a variety of children's programs, including infant, preschool, handicapped, and bilingual education programs.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement and Evaluation
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08540

ERIC publishes a series of non-technical papers designed to address non-methodologists on issues of evaluation and measurement.

Appendix I

Spodek Framework for Analyzing Programs

1.0 Assumptions--The basic "givens" of a program

1.1 Assumptions about the client. How does the program conceive of the child and of childhood? Are parents considered clients as well?

1.2 Assumptions about the educative process. Are there specific theories of learning or of instruction underlying the program? Are they related?

1.3 Assumptions about the school. Is the school conceived as a broad social agency or narrowly concerned with limited learning?

1.4 Assumptions about the teacher. Is the teacher considered as an instrument of the program or is she a major decision maker?

2.0 Goals of the program--The purposes of the program

2.1 Long-range goals. What long-range objectives are to be achieved?

2.2 Short-term objectives. Are immediate objectives stated?

2.3 Relationship between the two. Is there consistency between long- and short-range goals?

2.4 Degree of specificity of objectives. Are objectives stated as observable behavior? Are objectives stated in other ways?

3.0 Curriculum--The content of the program

3.1 Range of content of the program. Is the program broadly conceived?

3.2 Sequence of learnings or experiences. Is a specific sequence prescribed?

4.0 Method--The teaching strategies used

4.1 Child-child transactions. What is the nature of the child and child transaction behavior?

4.2 Child-teacher transactions. What is the nature of the child and teacher transaction behavior?

4.3 Child-materials transactions. What is the nature of the child and material transaction behavior?

4.4 Explicitness of prescriptions. How explicitly are these transactions prescribed?

5.0 Style--The degree of personalization allowed in teaching the program.

6.0 Organization--The way in which elements are put together.

- 6.1 Scheduling. How is time used?
- 6.2 Spatial organization. How are resources deployed?
- 6.3 Grouping of children. Are children grouped in some specific manner in the program?
- 6.4 Use of staff. What kinds of staffing patterns are suggested?

7.0 Effectiveness

- 7.1 Achievement of goals. Is there information about the degree to which the program can achieve its goals?
- 7.2 Comparisons with other programs. How does the program compare with the available programs?

8.0 Practicality

- 8.1 Cost of program. How much does the program cost to implement?
- 8.2 Staff requirements. How many staff members are needed? What sorts of qualifications are required?
- 8.3 Space requirements. How much space is needed?
- 8.4 Materials requirements. What kinds of materials must be used in the program? How many?
- 8.5 Availability of supportive resources. Are the necessary materials available? Are resource materials and persons available to support the program?

Source: Bernard Spodek. Teaching in the early years. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972, 311-312.

Appendix II

Formative Evaluation Summary Worksheet

1. Focus of Evaluation: _____

_____

_____

2. Goal(s) Related to Focus: _____

_____

_____

3. Objectives Related to Goal(s)

3a. Goal
3a. 1
3a. 2
3a. n
> objectives

4. Measurement Techniques Used: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Summary of Findings: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Specific, Needed Program Improvements: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many of the ideas in this primer resulted from my work with the staffs of the Santa Monica Children's Centers. They always created the time and climate which enabled my students and myself to discuss evaluation issues. I would like to acknowledge the staffs of:

John Adams Children's Center, Rose Honda - Head Teacher

Lincoln Child Development Center, Lee Murray - Head Teacher

McKinley Children's Center, Helen Condon - Head Teacher

Ocean Park Children's Center, Janis Minton - Head Teacher

Docia Zavitkovsky, Director of the Children's Centers, not only provided support throughout, but insight and humor as well.

R.T.
Summer 1976